REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27, and 31-36 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are amended herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

No new matter is believed to be added herein. The changes to the application are fully supported by the original disclosure, including, for example, original paragraphs [02] and [16]. Specifically, with regards to the amendment of "a windows-type operating system" in Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21, Applicants respectfully submit a windows-type operating system is a term well known to one of ordinary skill in the art, and includes, for example, the Microsoft® Windows® family of operating systems.

Claim Objections

Independent claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are objected to for having misspelled text. Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 have been amended and no longer contain the misspelled text. Applicants respectfully request the objection to claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action states that the "limitation reciting 'a Microsoft® Windows® operating system which does not allow the connection icon to be modified from the desktop by the user to alter the connection of the connection icon in absence of the software feature'" is ambiguous because, as the Office Action contends, U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0088377 ("Henriquez") allegedly discloses that the Microsoft® Windows® NT Server® operating system employing a Remote Desktop Protocol does allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop by the user to alter the connection

of the connection icon. The claims are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for using trademarks as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, namely, the Microsoft® Windows® operating system.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the contention that Henriquez discloses the above-identified feature, as discussed in further detail below. Furthermore, without conceding the correctness of the rejection, and in order to expedite prosecution of the application, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 to no longer recite the Microsoft® Windows® operating system. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections of Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 101

Independent Claims 1, 17, and 21, and the claims that depend therefrom, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, because the claims are allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, and in order to expedite prosecution of the application, Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 to recite that "the desktop is operative to display, using a processor, at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop," and amended independent Claim 21 to recite "means for displaying, using a processor, at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop." Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 21, as amended, are tied to a machine, i.e., a processor. Applicants have amended Claim 17 to recite "a non-transitory computer readable medium," as suggested in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 1, 17, and 21 are directed to statutory subject matter, and respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 17, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1, 7, 17, 21, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,295,556 ("Falcon"), in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0003371 ("Coulthard"), and further in view of Henriquez. Claims 3, 9, 19, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Falcon, in view of Coulthard, and further in view of Henriquez, and further in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0091850 ("Perholtz"). Claims 4, 10, 25, 27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Falcon, in view of Coulthard, and further in view of Henriquez, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,039,709 ("Beadle"). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Falcon, in view of Coulthard, and further in view of Henriquez, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,181,524 ("Lele"). Claims 6, 12, 20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Falcon, in view of Coulthard, and further in view of Henriquez, and further in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0183831 ("Ritchy"). Claims 11 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Falcon, in view of Coulthard, and further in view of Henriquez, and further in view of Beadle, and further in view of Lele. These rejections are respectfully traversed, and reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The Office Action concedes that Falcon and Coulthard do not disclose a user interface that comprises a software feature configured to allow a user to select and modify a connection icon from a desktop of a remote computing device to alter a connection of the connection icon, wherein the remote computing device includes a Microsoft® Windows® operating system which does not allow the connection icon to be modified from the desktop by the user to alter the

connection icon in absence of the software feature. Office Action, p.11. The Office Action, however, contends that Henriquez remedies this deficiency; the Office Action contends that FIG. 2 and paragraph [0036] of Henriquez describes that:

> "a communication between a local system 210 and a remote system 220, wherein the local system can run an application residing on the remote system, and wherein the remote system sends icon information for the application to the local system, so that when a user selects an icon associated with the remote application on the local system, a remote desktop connection is established; further disclosing that at least a subset of the transmitted iconic connection data is persistent in the memory of the local system, and can be updated with later format versions, etc.

Office Action, pp.11-12. The Office Action also states that paragraphs [0006], [0030], and [0031] of Henriquez disclose "that the remote computing device includes a Microsoft® Windows® operating system, e.g., Windows NT SERVER® operating system with Remote Desktop Protocol (RDP) feature." Office Action, p.12. Applicants respectfully disagree with the contention that Henriquez remedies the deficiencies of Falcon and Coulthard.

Applicants further submit that neither in the above-referenced characterization of Henriquez from the Office Action nor anywhere else in Henriquez does Henriquez teach or suggest the features of the independent claims, particularly with respect to the features of a "user interface [that] comprises a software feature configured to allow a user to select a connection icon from the desktop of the remote computing device and alter a connection of the connection icon ... wherein the remote computing device includes a windows-type operating system which does not allow the connection of the connection icon to be modified from the desktop by the user in absence of the software feature," as recited in each of the independent claims, namely Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21.

Henriquez is directed to a system for transmitting icon information from a remote system to a local system, wherein the icon is displayed such that the application, from which the icon is

extracted, appears to reside on the local system, rather than the remote system, where the application actually resides. Henriquz, Abstract. Henriquez does <u>not</u>, however, teach or even suggest that the <u>icon</u> is placed <u>on the desktop of the local system</u> and used to <u>alter a connection</u> between the local system and the remote system. Instead, the connection between the local system and the remote system of Henriquez is assumed to exist in order for Henriquez's system to function; that <u>underlying connection is not disclosed as being altered</u>. *See* Henriquez, paragraphs [0010] and [0050], and FIG. 6.

Accordingly, Falcon, Coulthard, and Henriquez, whether alone or in combination, in view of what was known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, do not teach or suggest a "user interface [that] comprises a software feature configured to allow a user to select a connection icon from the desktop of the remote computing device and alter a connection of the connection icon ... wherein the remote computing device includes a windows-type operating system which does not allow the connection of the connection icon to be modified from the desktop by the user in absence of the software feature," as recited in each of the independent claims.

Furthermore, the Office Action does not identify aspects of the other cited references that remedy the above-identified deficiencies. Therefore, the claimed software features would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of filing without the benefit of impermissible hindsight gleaned from the disclosure of the instant application.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are allowable, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 are respectfully requested.

The other claims currently under consideration in the application are dependent from their respective independent claims discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least similar reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the dependent claims are respectfully requested.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be other reasons for patentability of any or all claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede, or an actual concession of, any issue with regard to any claim, or any cited art, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502203 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

/Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub/
Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub, Reg. # 39,266

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 500
Irvine, CA 92612-7108
Phone: 949.851.0633 AAS:kcc
Facsimile: 949.851.9348
Date: May 4, 2010

**Please recognize our Customer No. 31824
as our correspondence address.**